

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6 and 15-18 have been allowed.

In the Office Action, Claims 7-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 7 was objected to for an informality of the phrase “wherein t is the number of encoders” being unclear.

Claims 7 and 11 have been amended. No new matter is presented.

In regard to the rejection of independent Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Office Action alleges that the specification “does not have support for ‘distributing the parallel data stream and the at least one operator bit [...] equally to the encoders and block coding’”. (Office Action, page 2, emphasis in original.) In regard to independent Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Office Action similarly alleges that the specification “does not have support for [...] ‘a plurality of encoders, each for receiving an equal number of the parallel data streams and the at least one operator bit’ as claimed in claim 11.” (Office Action, page 2, emphasis in original.) Citing ¶0098 of the publication of the pending application, the Office Action alleges that the “second encoder is the only one receiving the parity bit or input operator data.” (Office Action, page 2.)

Applicants respectfully disagree. At page 15, lines 5-9 (corresponding to the cited ¶0098), the specification explains that “The parity data $k_{w-(r-3)}$ to k_w and the information data k_1 to $k_{w-(r-2)}$ are fed to a plurality of encoders, here two encoders 1716 and 1718. The two encoders 1716 and 1718 each receive an equal half of the data.” Nonetheless, to advance prosecution of this application Claims 7 and 11 have been amended to eliminate the language identified in the Office Action.


The amendment to Claim 7 also overcomes to the objection to the informality related to the phrase “wherein t is the number of encoders” (Office Action, page 2).

In view of the above, it is believed that Claims 7-14 are in condition for allowance. Claims 1-6 and 15-18 have been allowed. Accordingly, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, it is requested that the Examiner contact

Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written over a horizontal line.

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, PC
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard, Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
TEL: (516) 228-3565

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicants